**Tabulated Response to Comments on the Draft CPD Syria (2016-2017)**

**November 20 2015**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments from Syrian Arab Republic** | **Status** |
| **1- para No 3**:    Second, the five years of crisis have brought about massive socio-economic losses – estimated until the end of 2014 at $200 billion or more in most productive sectors of manufacturing, agriculture, transport, and communications, as well as capital asset loss and saving and investments depletion. Markets, and traditional industrial and commercial hubs such as Aleppo and Homs, have been destroyed. The currency of the country has depreciated to one-sixth of its pre-crisis value, trade with its neighbours is stalled, and unilateral economic and financial measures are exacerbating the negative economic situation **as well as humanitarian situation in Syria.**The result is that over 80 per cent of the population – over 60 per cent of whom are already extremely poor – have been plunged deeper into poverty, and over 50 per cent of the labour force have been pushed into unemployment. | Changed in CPD |
| **2- Para No 5:****~~Without security~~ Insecurity in some areas and shortage of** jobs, services or infrastructure, the living conditions of Syrians and their livelihood prospects have eroded significantly, increasing their vulnerability and undermining their ability to  | Changed in CPD |
| **3- Para No 14:**The country office, **with full coordination with the national partners**, will identify target areas and beneficiaries through participatory, evidence-based planning processes with its national and local partners, using available assessments of needs and priorities. All this will be captured using the information management and analysis tool, combining information from **both the multi-organization humanitarian needs overview (such as beneficiary profile, location, and severity ranking) and** the UNDP governorate assessment and prioritizing profile, which contains data on socio-economic vulnerability throughout the country.  | First change reflected in CPD as ‘…with full *cooperation*…’Second part: request is to delete the bold, underlined sentence. As agreed with MOFA, this is reflected as a footnote in the CPD. |
| **4- Para No 20:**Youth are a major focus group of livelihood opportunities generation so as to reduce incentives to foster negative coping mechanisms **~~join the fighting and foster positive coping mechanisms.~~** Given the positive role of youth in supporting their communities, and recognizing that strengthening their capacities will enhance community resilience, UNDP partners with youth to ensure their active engagement in livelihood and social inclusion programmes and innovation opportunities to create solutions that respond effectively to the impact of the crisis.  Chambers of commerce, technical directorates, and the private sector will be the key national and local partners ensuring the sustainability of livelihood-related initiatives. Non-governmental organizations and faith-based organizations are crucial in delivering livelihood interventions in the targeted geographic areas, as well in engaging local communities. Participation and engagement, together with livelihood opportunities, are expected to increase collaboration and promote **~~tolerance and co-existence~~****social cohesion.** Together they will provide alternative opportunities to migration and radicalization in favour of community stabilization. | Changed in CPD |
| **5- Para No 31:**  The country office has undergone a restructuring process to ensure that it begins the new country programme with a relevant, cost-effective, and forward-looking set-up. New areas in the structure include the development of two programme teams supported by a field coordination unit, as well as a strategic advisory team and a programme management and support team that did not previously exist. In addition to the recently strengthened procurement capacity in the country office, expansion of the programme – perhaps due to greater funding availability for scaling up projects or resulting from a political settlement – would warrant rapid deployment of human resource capacity through staffing and the retention of national and international consultants. **Some obstacles might arise due to the possibility of the low availability of local talent** **~~resulting from the sustained outflow of qualified nationals.~~** UNDP will ensure that timely planning, leveraging support from the Regional Bureau for the Arab States regional hub and strong local partnership, will minimize the risk of delays attributable to lack of human resources. | Changed in CPD |
| **Para 32**, The programme will be implemented at the national and local levels, informed by evidence-based research though national think-tank capacity and assessments, piloting innovative practices for evidence, replication, and drawing of lessons learned in 2014-2015. UNDP **will undertake a joint evaluation of the program, and will** focus on enhanced results-based management, aided by its information management and analysis team, and in line with the strategic framework results matrix and the integrated results and resources framework of the strategic plan as well as undertaking, in order to inform future policy and practice through lessons learned. Projects will include measures to document lessons learned, ensure capture of knowledge from stakeholders, and enhance South-South exchange of knowledge. UNDP will emphasize knowledge generation and communication and will draw on available regional and global knowledge hubs and available national expertise. | Request for ‘joint’ evaluation is included in paragraph 33 as ‘joint mid-term outcome-level evaluation’ |
| **Para 38,** The UNDP office in Damascus **will be managed through joint committees at several levels,** contribute quality assurance and will rely on the institutional system for planning, management, monitoring and reporting, especially through the integrated work plan and the integrated results and resources framework of the UNDP strategic plan for stronger linkage between country, regional, and global results, while maintaining a locally designed database to collect, analyse and report. Audits and evaluations will be conducted based on annual plans, and risk-mitigation measures will be enforced and regularly monitored for more informed decision-making.  | UNDP COs are not managed through joint committees. The comment has alternatively been reflected in para 30 as ‘The country programme, managed through joint committees at several levels, will be implemented through a mix of direct implementation with a process of moving toward support to national implementation, based on ongoing assessment. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments from Sweden** | **Status** |
| The country analyses in the program rationale largely corresponds to Sweden’s analyses.  Sweden supports  the resilience approach and the two proposed outcomes for UNDP - livelihoods and basic services. |  |
| The UN:s humanitarian response plan (SRP) is increasingly involving resilience components including livelihoods. How will OCHA and UNDP coordinate their respective areas of responsibility? This aspect should be clarified in the document to explain how the intention of complementarity will be put to practice.  | Comment noted. Beyond ensuring that complementarity will take place, and this is referenced in the document, there is no room to add more detail in the CPD. In fact, discussions about complementarity between the new humanitarian plan for 2016 (HRP), the new CPD (2016 and 2017) and the new Strategic Framework for the entire UN system (2016-2017) are taking place in multiple settings including the HCT and UNCT, the sectors (including the Early Recovery and Livelihoods sector which UNDP leads), the Whole of Syria meetings, etc…OCHA is the coordinating body for the humanitarian response plan while UNDP is the lead on Early Recovery and Livelihoods sector within the HRP, not only for coordination purposes but also for advocacy, planning and implementation of resilience related activities/approaches/programmes. |
| UNDP mentions, under Outcome 1, welding and carpentry as “market-relevant” vocations. Is there any evidence for absorption capacity within local labour markets for these professions? | Comment noted. No change required in CPD. For UNDP’s programme development, reference is always made to the governorate profile and bottom up/area-based participatory planning methods that help identifying priorities, defining interventions as per market needs and population needs. Local committees are the ones identifying these needs. |
| UNDP acknowledges that success under Outcome 2 “assumes inclusive, participatory planning and implementation processes among stakeholders and affected communities”. What is the UNDP methods to ensure this? Is there any plan to strengthen such processes within the framework of UNDP’s programme in Syria, i.e. to work for good governance in Syrian institutions and civil society as a mainstreamed priority like crises management capacity? | Comment noted. No change required in CPD text. UNDP has a capacity development strategy for the Syrian civil society actors including training and hands-on experience sharing on good governance principles. At the local level, good governance is also applied when dealing with local technical directorates for infrastructure rehabilitation, solid waste and debris management. Through a bottom-up approach for every initiative, UNDP brings together local leadership, municipalities, civil society, and faith-based organizations among others to ensure that local governance, even if informal, is in place to contribute to design and implementation of livelihoods and basic service rehabilitation projects. Additionally, and in in line with the UN Strategic Framework for 2016-2017, the first strategic outcome is about rebuilding and strategic national capacity to respond to crisis through enhanced evidence-based planning and monitoring. |
| What is UNDP’s assessment of the state of implementing the “Whole of Syria approach” which Sweden fully supports? | UNDP supports the Whole of Syria approach as part of the 2015 SRP. UNDP has developed a paper on what resilience programming might include as part of WoS, and is finalizing the recruitment of an Early Recovery Coordinator to cover Gaziantep and Amman complementing the work of the Damascus based coordinator and the Whole of Syria Coordinator.  |
| The concrete outcomes of the Resilience Development Forum held in Amman 8-9 November is yet to be seen. What implications does the UNDP see for its program in Syria in light of the conference?  | Comment noted. Resilience approach already applied in CPD, therefore no change required in CPD text. For the past year, UNDP has been playing a major role in advancing the resilience building inside Syria approach, where concrete actions adopted by other humanitarian sectors and agencies have been progressing well and contributing to the resilience of the affected communities and population (local production, local procurement, labor intensive schemes…) including through partnerships with UNDP (UNICEF and WHO for rehabilitation of infrastructure…) Indeed, it is the positive developments in Syria, in terms of actually achieving resilience-oriented results (see attached results and maybe share with Sweden) that were included as inputs into the RDF, showing that resilience inside Syria is possible and at some scale. Some learning and new ideas from the RDF could include additional momentum for working with the private sector, engaging regionally to prepare for if/when spontaneous returns begin to happen (already a discussion between UNDP and UNHCR offices in Syria and Lebanon is taking place). Following the RDF, UNDP will continue providing such technical support to sister agencies, INGOs and Syrian NGOs based on the lessons learned from its resilience building programme (2013-to date). |